

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-18 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6, 8-10, 15, 17 and 18 have been amended and Claims 5 and 14 have been canceled without prejudice by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 8-10 were objected to; Claims 1-6, 8-15 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Iino et al.; and Claims 7 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Iino et al. in view of Kubota et al.

Regarding the objection to Claims 1 and 8-10, Claims 1 and 8-10 have been amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-6, 8-15 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Iino et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to an image forming apparatus that includes a writing device, a developing device, an upper duct and a lower duct and a single air intake fan configured to take outside-air into the upper duct and the lower duct. Amended independent Claim 10 includes similar features.

In a non-limiting example, FIG. 2 illustrates a single air intake fan 60 that takes outside-air into the upper duct 50 and into the lower duct 52.

Iino et al. does not describe a single air intake fan. In FIGS. 2A and 4, Iino et al. illustrates two distinct fans, fan 32 and fan 22 (misabeled in FIG. 4 as 223), that are used to separately move air in upper and lower air ducts. Thus, Iino et al. does not teach a single air intake fan configured to take outside-air into the upper duct and the lower duct. Accordingly,

it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 10 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Claims 7 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Iino et al. in view of Kubota et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7 and 16 depend on Claims 1 and 10, respectively, which as discussed above are believed to be allowable. Further, it is respectfully submitted Kubota et al. does not teach or suggest the features recited in the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

Further, the specification has been amended to correct a minor informality.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.



Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER, & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No.: 25,599

Tel.: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
GJM/DAB/ZSS/dnf  
I:\ATTY\ZS\217692US\217692US-AMENDMENT.DOC

David A. Bilodeau  
Registration No. 42,325